```
show files
File   8:Ei Compendex(R) 1970-2003/Jul W3
         (c) 2003 Elsevier Eng.  Info. Inc.
File  15:ABI/Inform(R) 1971-2003/Jul 26
         (c) 2003 ProQuest Info&Learning
File  16:Gale Group PROMT(R) 1990-2003/Jul 29
         (c) 2003 The Gale Group
File  47:Gale Group Magazine DB(TM) 1959-2003/Jul 21
         (c) 2003 The Gale group
File  75:TGG Management Contents(R) 86-2003/Jul W2
         (c) 2003 The Gale Group
File  88:Gale Group Business A.R.T.S. 1976-2003/Jul 22
         (c) 2003 The Gale Group
File  98:General Sci Abs/Full-Text 1984-2003/Jun
         (c) 2003 The HW Wilson Co.
File 148:Gale Group Trade & Industry DB 1976-2003/Jul 29
         (c)2003 The Gale Group
File 180:Federal Register 1985-2003/Jul 29
         (c) 2003 format only The DIALOG Corp
File 349:PCT FULLTEXT 1979-2002/UB=20030724,UT=20030717
         (c) 2003 WIPO/Univentio
File 436:Humanities Abs Full Text 1984-2003/Jun
         (c) 2003 The HW Wilson Co
File 484:Periodical Abs Plustext 1986-2003/Jul W3
         (c) 2003 ProQuest
File 553:Wilson Bus. Abs. FullText 1982-2003/Jun
         (c) 2003 The HW Wilson Co
File 660:Federal News Service 1991-2002/Jul 02
         (c) 2002 Federal News Service
File 781:ProQuest Newsstand 1998-2003/Jul 29
         (c) 2003 ProQuest Info&Learning
File 994:NewsRoom 2001
         (c) 2003 The Dialog Corporation

ds

Set     Items   Description
S1         32   TENNESSEE AND EASTMAN AND DIVISION AND PROCESS AND HAZARD -
               AND ANALYSIS
S2         27   RD S1 (unique items)
S3          2   S2 AND (TENNESSEE(N)EASTMAN(N)DIVISION)
S4          4   S2 AND (PROCESS(N)HAZARD(N)ANALYSIS)
S5          5   S3 OR S4
S6          4   S2 AND (TENNESSEE(N)EASTMAN)
S7          6   S5 OR S6

?t 7/9/all

 7/9/1     (Item 1 from file: 8)
DIALOG(R)File   8:Ei Compendex(R)
(c) 2003 Elsevier Eng.  Info. Inc. All rts. reserv.

04409921   E.I. No: EIP96053197860
  Title: Team-based approach to mechanical integrity implementation
  Author: Herrington, Edwin F. III
  Corporate Source: Eastman Chemical Co, Kingsport, TN, USA
  Source: Process Safety Progress v 15 n 2 Summer 1996. p 110-113
```

Publication Year: 1996
CODEN: PSAPE2 ISSN: 1066-8527
Language: English
Document Type: JA; (Journal Article) Treatment: G; (General Review)
Journal Announcement: 9607W3

Abstract: The U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) promulgated the Process Safety Management of Highly Hazardous Chemicals standard (29CFR 1910.119) in 1992. One key provision of the regulation calls for a Mechanical Integrity (MI) program to ensure that process equipment containing and controlling highly hazardous chemicals is maintained to high standards, standards which minimize the chances of accidental release and subsequent injuries or incidents. This article addresses the approach taken by Tennessee Eastman Division in the implementation of the OSHA MI requirements. (Author abstract) 7 Refs.

Descriptors: Risk assessment; Standards; Laws and legislation; Hazardous materials; Chemicals; Accident prevention; Chemical equipment; Hazards; Process engineering; Management

Identifiers: Mechanical integrity; Hazardous chemicals; Process safety management; Process hazard analysis

Classification Codes:
914.1 (Accidents & Accident Prevention); 902.2 (Codes & Standards); 902.3 (Legal Aspects); 802.1 (Chemical Plants & Equipment); 913.1 (Production Engineering)
914 (Safety Engineering); 902 (Engineering Graphics & Standards); 804 (Chemical Products); 802 (Chemical Apparatus & Plants); 913 (Production Planning & Control)
91 (ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT); 90 (GENERAL ENGINEERING); 80 (CHEMICAL ENGINEERING)

7/9/2 (Item 1 from file: 15)
DIALOG(R)File 15:ABI/Inform(R)

01871839 05-22831
Risk-based methods optimize maintenance work scope
Merrick, Edwin A; Leonard, C Ron; Eckhardt, Phil; Baughman, Harry
Oil & Gas Journal v97n31 PP: 47-52 Aug 2, 1999 ISSN: 0030-1388
JRNL CODE: OGJ
DOC TYPE: Journal article LANGUAGE: English LENGTH: 5 Pages
SPECIAL FEATURE: Charts Graphs References
WORD COUNT: 2753

ABSTRACT: The application of risk-based prioritization for scheduling maintenance and turnaround activities can yield significant economic advantages. Reliable data and a commitment to a risk-based strategy could reduce downtime days by 10% and execution costs by 15%. The implementation of a risk-based inspection strategy was applied at two plants with the help of Aptech Engineering Services Corp.: one at Tennessee Eastman Division of Eastman Chemical Co., Kingsport, Tennessee , and the other at Tesoro Hawaii Corp.'s Kapolei, Hawaii, refinery. Information obtained from the risk-based methodology was used to enhance safety, performance, and management of the turnarounds.

7/9/3 (Item 1 from file: 16)
DIALOG(R)File 16:Gale Group PROMT(R)

03026697 Supplier Number: 44112174 (THIS IS THE FULLTEXT)
TURNING THE PROGRAMS INTO A PROCESS
Chemical Week, p39
Sept 22, 1993
ISSN: 0009-272X
Language: English Record Type: Fulltext
Document Type: Magazine/Journal; Trade
Word Count: 2130
TEXT:
At almost every level of operation in the chemical process industries one is likely to hear about 'programitis,' a state of being snowed under by myriad management programs and being left little or no time to do the 'real work.' With the advent of Responsible Care, ISO 9000, new environmental and safety regulations, and worldwide recession, management is scrambling to do a lot more with a lot less.

Oddly enough, industry leaders say that total quality management (TQM), depicted in the press during the past year as something akin to a dog-and-pony show, has provided a methodology for consolidating management initiatives. Many companies say they are using the basic principles of TQM to build an umbrella process that can accommodate any program that is aligned to a company's basic goals.

This week's cover story illustrate's efforts to achieve the focus to manage the program surge, with an attempt to look behind the negative image that has formed around quality. Even though there has been a drop-off in applications for the Malcolm Baldrige award, for example, the number of companies using the Baldrige criteria to steer their efforts is high. A look at solid results attributed to quality management in Europe is included, as well as an overall description of the evolution of quality into areas such as environmental management. Perspective is given by Joseph Juran, a pioneer of quality management, who is now on a final lecture tour before his retirement at 89.

Using TQM tools to build an umbrella:

The dirtiest word in the chemical industry may be 'program.' Speaking to most managers, you will be corrected in midsentence if you refer to any of a number of current industry initiatives - ISO 9000, Responsible Care, OSHA 1910, total quality management (TQM) - as programs. You will be reminded that these are not programs but processes - they have no beginning or end. They are how the company does business.

Industry managers have become touchy about this distinction primarily because of the proliferation of initiatives in the past five years. Coming from government, industry associations, and the executive suite, management initiatives are piling up. Each is labeled top priority, and most require a staggering amount of resources - primarily in the form of labor hours. This has placed many managers in a damage control mode: They must position each new business process as part of a holistic approach to continuous improvement and the attainment of world-class competitiveness in a grueling industry. Many are turning to the principles of quality management to build this 'umbrella process .'

On the surface, this may seem like the greatest contortion act in management history. How do you use simple concepts of customer satisfaction and continuous improvement to tie together product stewardship, plant safety, employee empowerment and compliance with environmental regulation? It is not surprising that many workers see no 'umbrella process ' and complain that there is too much on their plate. Those trying to use quality management to build continuity say quality will have to evolve into areas such as environmental management in order for it to work. However, they

mostly agree that goal orientation - now seen as the determining factor in the success of any quality management program - may be the glue that builds the big process . Adopting only those initiatives that target the clear goals of the corporation, they say, provides a focus that can result in a consolidation of efforts.

ON THE MENU. Nancy Tague, manager of performance improvement at Ethyl Corp. (Richmond, VA), says she hears a lot about 'program du jour thinking,' especially from people at the plant. 'The common refrain is that they have no time to run the plant.' The company, however, is not about to backpedal on quality management, ISO 9000, and Responsible Care, she says. 'The trick is to see them as complimentary and find ways they can be done in concert.' Carol Eicher, director of quality at Ashland Chemical (Columbus, OH) agrees, turning immediately to the use of a quality principle in simplifying the process . 'We simply can't work harder or more hours,' says Eicher. 'We need to figure out ways to eliminate work that doesn't matter to our customers.'

The Total Quality Council of the Chemical Manufacturers Association (CMA; Washington) has picked up on this, forming a team earlier this year to construct a matrix of business management initiatives around the management practices of the Responsible Care process safety code. Work was done in conjunction with CMA's engineering and operations committee as a means to help plant managers comply with that code.

According to Jeanne Burnell, director of quality management for Cytec (West Paterson, NJ) and chair of the CMA matrix study group, the effort focused on facilitating plant managers, whom she described as the group most at risk of being overwhelmed by multiple management initiatives. By lining up process safety with coordinating elements of ISO 9000, the Malcolm Baldrige Award, and OSHA's process safety management directive, the matrix illustrates that quality management provides a uniform methodology for doing work in all these areas. 'The bottom line.' says Burnell, 'is if you use the principles of TQM you'll have a safe plant.' The message is that quality management is not added work but a way to do work. 'Using the classic cycle of plan, do, check, act,' says Burnell, 'things go smoothly with less waste.'

Langley Spurlock, director of CMA's Chemstar Division , says total quality tools should be useful beyond safety in the broad implementation of Responsible Care. He says the interplay between the disciplines has effectively redefined quality to include environmental management. As an example, he cites the development in the U.K. of environmental auditing as an offshoot of the ISO 9000 quality standard. Burnell says the CMA may soon elect to study similar matrices for other codes in Responsible Care.

Robert Joines, v.p. quality/health, safety, and environment for Eastman Chemical (Kingsport, TN) says understanding the umbrella concept begins with understanding the full range of industrial quality management. 'We have to recognize there are a number of components, many of which are articulated in the Baldrige Award criteria,' says Joines. These include leadership, data analysis , planning, people issues, process management, result orientation, and customer satisfaction. He adds, 'Once you recognize that quality is all these things, there is no dilemma when you start talking about ISO 9000, employee empowerment, and planning. It's under the same umbrella. Responsible Care issues are things you have to do, and quality is how you do them. Quality is not an objective. Your objective is achieving results and meeting customer expectations.'

ISO 9000, Joines says, is completely compatible with quality. In fact it is a necessary component of the system. 'It standardizes procedures,' says Joines. 'That's important. How can you improve something if it isn't standardized?'

Standardization and results orientation have merged quite dynamically at Eastman and other larger chemical firms. 'Several years ago we saw the wisdom of managing everything at once,' says Bill Garwood, president of Tennessee Eastman . 'We decided we'd become a world class chemical company by managing seven things.' Eastman 's list includes safety, environmental performance, capital management, human resources, and community relations. Garwood explains that Eastman , relying heavily on delegating responsibility to the task level, focuses all management initiatives on the list of goals.

Richard Doliniski, v.p./employee development and quality performance, describes a similar system at Dow Chemical (Midland, MI). 'We focus all efforts toward achieving six goals. These are customer satisfaction, employee involvement, variability reduction, partnership with suppliers, cross-functional teamwork, and productivity. The company has set this year as the deadline for specific achievements in each goal area and will issue a new set of goals by 1994. Dolinski says the goal set allows Dow to prioritize all efforts coming from management initiatives.

Eastman 's Garwood says prioritization is a constant focus. 'We get feedback all the time that our plate is too full. I tell division managers they have to decide the highest priority for business in their division and put off until next year everything that can wait and move forward on a quality basis.' For example, he says pressure to register facilities under ISO 9000 may mean that statistical training programs will be put off. Eastman , he says, is beginning its annual process of prioritizing its goals for each division .

BACK TO WORK. 'Part of the quality concept is to prioritize work and approach it methodically,' says Susan Adzick, director of quality management with OxyChem (Dallas). Ashland's Eicher agrees. 'We do a lot of things every day, and a lot because we've always done them that way. We have to look at our processes and simplify them.'

Business simplification, as he calls it, is on the front burner at Betz Laboratories, according to senior v.p. Bob Moore. 'We've charged our quality management department with using the quality process to simplify and improve processes,' says Moore. 'We want them to look at internal systems and make them simpler. We want to get back to work and off quality teams. In essence, we want to give manufacturing and delivery guys more time to do their jobs without being bogged down with antiquated business systems.' He says, however, that Betz must remain highly involved in Responsible Care and ISO 9000.

Much of this points to the popular practice of business process reengineering, which most quality managers see as a broad systematic approach to quality management. Another important aspect of reengineering being pursued is interdepartmental planning and operation, in which the connection between traditional separate departments, such as order processing and manufacturing, are studied and maximized to reduce labor time system-wide. 'At Ethyl,' says Tague, 'we're moving to integrate planning so all functional departments reflect each other's needs as partners.'

While quality managers see a great deal of synergy between the myriad of current management initiatives in the chemical industry, communicating this to line workers and top management is a challenge. Dolinski says Dow takes a structured approach to educating workers about the quality process . It includes training - which could include up to 3000 hours of quality training - executive 'listening sessions,' and an internal quality award. It reaches top management through its Executive Leadership series.

UP FRONT. Getting managers to see a one-system approach is a particular challenge, according to Angelo Rossetti, senior v.p./total

quality and strategic planning at Elf Atochem North America (Philadelphia). Like others, he admits the message is not fully understood throughout the company. 'We believe it will happen,' says Rossetti. 'The easiest approach is to force the change and explain it later,' he says. 'To explain change up front is an endless battle.'

Adzick, who also says understanding of the umbrella concept varies throughout the company, sees top management realizing that quality is 'not parallel thinking. It's how they do things, how they lead. It's not fully integrated at Oxy, but the more we have on our plate, the more people are gravitating toward the quality process . People are seeing more and more examples of how it has helped others.'

RICK MULLIN

Cross-Referencing a Responsible Care Code with ISO 9000, Total Quality Management, the Malcolm Baldrige Award, and OSHA's Process Safety Management Code

Map, '1992 Quality Award Activity,' showing states with quality award is place, quality award effort underway, Senate productivity award in place, no activity omitted.

CMA QUALITY COUNCIL'S PROCESS SAFETY/QUALITY MATRIX

Process Safety Code	ISO 9000	Total Quality(*)
Management Leadership	Management Responsibility	Leadership
Accountability	Responsibility & Authority	Human Resources/ Strategic Planning
Performance Measurement	Internal Quality Audits	Problem Solving
Incident Investigation	Corrective Action	Problem Solving
Information Sharing	-	Non-conforming Material
Community Input	-	Process Control
Design Documentation	Quality System	Key Control Characteristics
Hazards Documentation	Document Control	Process Control
Risk Assessment	Statistical Techniques	-
Management of Change	Process Control	Key Control Characteristics
Siting Impacts	-	-
Codes & Standards	-	-
Safety Reviews	-	New/Modified Product Application

Maintenance & Inspection	Inspection, Test Equipment	Process Control
Multiple Safeguards	-	-
Control in Emergency	Process Control	Process Control
Skills Identification	Quality System	Human Resources
Work Practices	Quality System	Documentation
Training	Training	Human Resources
Proficiency Demonstration	Training	-
Fitness-for-Duty	-	-
Contractor Programs	Contract Review	-
Process Safety Code	Malcolm Baldrige	OSHA PSM
Management Leadership	Senior Executive Leadership	-
Accountability	Management for Quality	-
Performance Measurement	Quality Assessment	Compliance Audits
Incident Investigation	Process Management Investigation	Incidental
Information Sharing	-	-
Community Input	Public Responsibility	-
Design Documentation	-	Operating Procedures
Hazards Documentation	Performance Data	Process Safety Information
Risk Assessment	-	Process Hazard Analysis
Management of Change	-	Management of Change
Siting Impacts	Public Responsibility	Process Hazard Analysis
Codes & Standards	Design and Introduction of Products	Process Safety Information

Safety Reviews	-	Pre-startup Safety Review
Maintenance & Inspection	-	Mechanical Integrity
Multiple Safeguards	-	Process Hazard Safety
Control in Emergency	-	Emergency Planning
Skills Identification	Employee Education	Training
Work Practices	-	Hot Work Permit
Training	Employee Education	Training
Proficiency Demonstration	-	Training
Fitness-for-Duty	-	-
Contractor Programs	Supplier Quality	Contractors

(*) CMA's criteria for Continuous Improvement. Source: CMA Total Quality Council (Washington).

PUBLISHER NAME: Chemical Week Associates
EVENT NAMES: *220 (Strategy & planning)
GEOGRAPHIC NAMES: *1USA (United States)
PRODUCT NAMES: *2800000 (Chemicals & Allied Products)
INDUSTRY NAMES: BUSN (Any type of business); CHEM (Chemicals, Plastics and Rubber)
NAICS CODES: 325 (Chemical Manufacturing)
SPECIAL FEATURES: INDUSTRY

7/9/4 (Item 1 from file: 180)
DIALOG(R)File 180:Federal Register

DIALOG Accession Number: 03053118 Supplier Number: 65220077
Ergonomics Program
Volume: 65 Issue: 220 Page: 68262
CITATION NUMBER: 65 FR 68262
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2000

AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (DOL); Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)
DOCUMENT TYPE: Rules and Regulations
CFR: 29 CFR Part 1910
NUMBERS: Part II; RIN 1218-AB36; Docket No. S-777
DATES: Effective 20010116
CONTACT INFORMATION: OSHA's Ergonomics Team at (202) 693-2116, or visit the OSHA Homepage at www.osha.gov.
ACTION: Final rule.

INTERNAL DATA: FR Doc. 00-28854 Filed 11-13-00; 8:45 am
Word Count: 2153

SUMMARY: The Occupational Safety and Health Administration is issuing a final Ergonomics Program standard (29 CFR 1910.900) to address the significant risk of employee exposure to ergonomic risk factors in jobs in general industry workplaces. Exposure to ergonomic risk factors on the job leads to musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) of the upper extremities, back, and lower extremities. Every year, nearly 600,000 MSDs that are serious enough to cause time off work are reported to the Bureau of Labor Statistics by general industry employers, and evidence suggests that an even larger number of non-lost worktime MSDs occur in these workplaces every year.

The standard contains an "action trigger," which identifies jobs with risk factors of sufficient magnitude, duration, or intensity to warrant further examination by the employer. This action trigger acts as a screen. When an employee reports an MSD, the employer must first determine whether the MSD is an MSD incident, defined by the standard as an MSD that results in days away from work, restricted work, medical treatment beyond first aid, or MSD symptoms or signs that persist for 7 or more days. Once this determination is made, the employer must determine whether the employee's job has risk factors that meet the standard's action trigger. The risk factors addressed by this standard include repetition, awkward posture, force, vibration, and contact stress. If the risk factors in the employee's job do not exceed the action trigger, the employer does not need to implement an ergonomics program for that job.

If an employee reports an MSD incident and the risk factors of that employee's job meet the action trigger, the employer must establish an ergonomics program for that job. The program must contain the following elements: hazard information and reporting, management leadership and employee participation, job hazard analysis and control, training, MSD management, and program evaluation. The standard provides the employer with several options for evaluating and controlling risk factors for jobs covered by the ergonomics program, and provides objective criteria for identifying MSD hazards in those jobs and determining when the controls implemented have achieved the required level of control.

The final standard would affect approximately 6.1 million employers and 102 million employees in general industry workplaces, and employers in these workplaces would be required over the ten years following the promulgation of the standard to control approximately 18 million jobs with the potential to cause or contribute to covered MSDs. OSHA estimates that the final standard would prevent about 4.6 million work-related MSDs over the next 10 years, have annual benefits of approximately $9.1 billion, and impose annual compliance costs of $4.5 billion on employers. On a per-establishment basis, this equals approximately $700; annual costs per problem job fixed are estimated at $250.

DIALOG Accession Number: 02442355 Supplier Number: 980100514
Respiratory Protection
Volume: 63 Issue: 5 Page: 1152
CITATION NUMBER: 63 FR 1152

Date: THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1998

AGENCY: Department of Labor--(DOL); Occupational Safety and Health Administration--(OSHA)
DOCUMENT TYPE: Rules and Regulations
CFR: 29 CFR Part 1910 1926
NUMBERS: Docket No. H-049; RIN 1218-AA05
DATES: Effective: 19980408
Comment by: 19980309
CONTACT INFORMATION: Bonnie Friedman, Director, OSHA Office of Public Affairs, Room N-3647, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210; Telephone (202) 219-8148. For additional copies of this regulation contact: OSHA, Office of Publications, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N-3101, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210; Telephone (202) 219-4667.
ACTION: Final rule; Request for comment on paperwork requirements.
INTERNAL DATA: (FR Doc. 97-33843 Filed 12-31-97; 8:45 am)
Word Count: 143274

SUMMARY: This final standard, which replaces the respiratory protection standards adopted by OSHA in 1971 (29 CFR 1910.134 and 29 CFR 1926.103), applies to general industry, construction, shipyard, longshoring, and marine terminal workplaces. The standard requires employers to establish or maintain a respiratory protection program to protect their respirator-wearing employees. The standard contains requirements for program administration; worksite-specific procedures; respirator selection; employee training; fit testing; medical evaluation; respirator use; respirator cleaning, maintenance, and repair; and other provisions. The final standard also simplifies respirator requirements for employers by deleting respiratory provisions in other OSHA health standards that duplicate those in the final standard and revising other respirator-related provisions to make them consistent. In addition, the standard addresses the use of respirators in Immediately Dangerous to Life or Health (IDLH) atmospheres, including interior structural firefighting. During interior structural firefighting (an IDLH atmosphere by definition), self-contained breathing apparatus is required, and two firefighters must be on standby to provide assistance or perform rescue when two firefighters are inside the burning building.

Based on the record in this rulemaking and the Agency's own experience in enforcing its prior respiratory protection standards, OSHA has concluded that compliance with the final rule will assist employers in protecting the health of employees exposed in the course of their work to airborne contaminants, physical hazards, and biological agents, and that the standard is therefore necessary and appropriate. The final respiratory protection standard covers an estimated 5 million respirator wearers working in an estimated 1.3 million workplaces in the covered sectors. OSHA's benefits analysis predicts that the standard will prevent many deaths and illnesses among respirator-wearing employees every year by protecting them from exposure to acute and chronic health hazards. OSHA estimates that compliance with this standard will avert hundreds of deaths and thousands of illnesses annually. The annual costs of the standard are estimated to be $111 million, or an average of $22 per covered employee per year.

7/9/6 (Item 3 from file: 180)
DIALOG(R)File 180:Federal Register

DIALOG Accession Number: 02383801 Supplier Number: 960803164
Regulations Restricting the Sale and Distribution of Cigarettes and Smokeless Tobacco to Protect Children and Adolescents
Volume: 61 Issue: 168 Page: 44396
CITATION NUMBER: 61 FR 44396
Date: WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 28, 1996

AGENCY: Department of Health and Human Services--(HHS); Public Health Service--(PHS); Food and Drug Administration--(FDA)
DOCUMENT TYPE: Rules and Regulations
CFR: 21 CFR Part 801 803 804 807 820 897
NUMBERS: No. 95N-0253; RIN 0910-AA48
DATES: Effective: 19970828
Effective: 19970228
Effective: 19980228
CONTACT INFORMATION: Nancy Yeates, 301-827-0867
ACTION: Final rule
Word Count: 391372

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is issuing regulations governing access to and promotion of nicotine-containing cigarettes and smokeless tobacco to children and adolescents.

The regulations prohibit the sale of nicotine-containing cigarettes and smokeless tobacco to individuals under the age of 18; require manufacturers, distributors, and retailers to comply with certain conditions regarding the sale and distribution of these products; require retailers to verify a purchaser's age by photographic identification; prohibit all free samples and prohibit the sale of these products through vending machines and self-service displays except in facilities where individuals under the age of 18 are not present or permitted at any time; limit the advertising and labeling to which children and adolescents are exposed to a black-and-white, text-only format; prohibit the sale or distribution of brand-identified promotional nontobacco items such as hats and tee shirts; prohibit sponsorship of sporting and other events, teams, and entries in a brand name of a tobacco product, but permit such sponsorship in a corporate name; and require manufacturers to provide intended use information on all cigarette and smokeless tobacco product labels and in cigarette advertising.

These regulations will address the serious public health problems caused by cigarettes and smokeless tobacco products. They will reduce children's and adolescents' easy access to cigarettes and smokeless tobacco and will significantly decrease the amount of positive imagery that makes these products so appealing to that age group.

The regulations are predicated on the agency's assertion of jurisdiction under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act over cigarettes and smokeless tobacco as delivery devices for nicotine, incorporated as part of the regulations for purposes of, and to facilitate, congressional review under the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996.